

CNF RFP Consistency

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CROW CREEK PIPELINE EIS – CNF RFP COMPLIANCE CHECKLIST.....	3
1. Introduction.....	3
2. Resources	3
2.1 Wetlands and Water Resources	4
2.2 Soils and Erosion	5
2.3 Recreation	6
2.4 Vegetation Resources.....	6
2.5 Fisheries and Aquatic Resources	9
2.6 Wildlife Resources.....	11
2.7 Special Status Wildlife.....	12
2.8 Land Use	30
2.9 Cultural Resources	31
3. References.....	33

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1	Compliance with Applicable Caribou Forest Plan Standards and Guidelines for Watershed and Riparian Resources	4
Table 2	Compliance with Applicable Caribou Forest Plan Standards and Guidelines for Soils	5
Table 3	Compliance with Applicable Caribou Forest Plan Standards and Guidelines for Recreation	6
Table 4	Compliance with Applicable CNF RFP Standards and Guidelines for Vegetation.....	7
Table 5	Compliance with Applicable CNF RFP Standards and Guidelines for Noxious Weeds	9
Table 6	Compliance with Applicable CNF RFP Standards and Guidelines for AIZs	9
Table 7	Compliance with Applicable CNF RFP Standards and Guidelines for Wildlife.....	11
Table 8	Compliance with Applicable CNF RFP Standards and Guidelines for Bald Eagle	12
Table 9	Compliance with Applicable CNF RFP Standards and Guidelines for Boreal Owl....	13
Table 10	Compliance with Applicable CNF RFP Standards and Guidelines for Columbia Sharp-tailed Grouse	14
Table 11	Compliance with Applicable Standards and Guidelines from the Sage Grouse Amendment (USFS 2019).....	15
Table 12	Compliance with Applicable CNF RFP Standards and Guidelines for Flammulated Owl.....	18
Table 13	Compliance with Applicable CNF RFP Standards and Guidelines for Great Gray Owl	19
Table 14	Compliance with Applicable CNF RFP Standards and Guidelines for Northern Goshawk	20
Table 15	Compliance with Applicable CNF RFP Standards and Guidelines for Peregrine Falcon.....	22
Table 16	Compliance with Applicable CNF RFP Standards and Guidelines for Trumpeter Swan.....	23
Table 17	Compliance with Applicable CNF RFP Standards and Guidelines for Migratory Birds	24

Table 18	Compliance with Applicable CNF RFP Standards and Guidelines for Gray Wolves	25
Table 19	Compliance with USFS Management Directions for Canada Lynx	25
Table 20	Compliance with Applicable CNF RFP Standards and Guidelines for Townsend's Big-eared Bat	28
Table 21	USFS Management Direction for the North American Wolverine	29
Table 22	Compliance with Applicable CNF RFP Standards and Guidelines f o r Transportation and Utility Corridors	30
Table 23	Compliance with Applicable CNF RFP Standards and Guidelines for Cultural Resources	32

CROW CREEK PIPELINE EIS – CNF RFP COMPLIANCE CHECKLIST

1. INTRODUCTION

Chapter 3 of the Crow Creek Pipeline project (the project) Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS) presents the results of the environmental impact analyses for the various resources that may be affected by the Agency Preferred Alternative and described and disclosed direct and indirect changes to the human environment. The significance, intensity, and duration of effects have also been disclosed in the FEIS.

This document is a continuation of assessing impacts. Specifically, it contains information related to compliance of the Agency Preferred Alternative to the Caribou National Forest (CNF) Revised Forest Plan (RFP). The relationship of the FEIS to federal land management agency plans, including the RFP, was described in **Section 1.6.1** of the FEIS.

The CNF RFP (USFS 2003a) establishes forest-wide requirements that apply to - and regulate - future management activities. The US Forest Service (USFS) evaluates all proposed activities on National Forest System (NFS) land against these requirements (i.e., standards and guidelines). According to the RFP:

- *Standards are used to promote the achievement of the desired future condition and objectives and to assure compliance with laws, regulations, Executive Orders or policy direction established by the Forest Service. Standards are binding limitations on management activities that are within the authority of the Forest Service to enforce. A standard can also be expressed as a constraint on management activities or practices.*
- *Guidelines are used in the same way as standards but tend to be operationally flexible to respond to variations, such as changing site conditions or changed management circumstances. Guidelines are a preferred or advisable course of project, and they are expected to be carried out, unless site-specific analysis identifies a better approach.*

2. RESOURCES

RFP compliance information is presented below in tables organized by resource and/or topic, by order in which resources appeared in **Chapter 3**. The RFP standards and guidelines considered relevant to each resource are presented, along with a discussion of whether or not the project would be in compliance with the particular standard or guideline. Some resources do not have standards and guidelines that are relevant to the project; only those that do are included in the following sections. In addition, some resource tables (e.g., tables for many special status wildlife species) have additional detail relative to the standards and guidelines. This additional detail is a product of the analysis conducted in the Biological Assessment (BA) and Biological Evaluations (BEs) prepared for this project. The detail is preserved here for completeness.

2.1 Wetlands and Water Resources

Table 1 summarizes compliance with applicable standards and guidelines from the CNF RFP (USFS 2003a) with regard to wetlands and water resources under the Agency Preferred Alternative.

Table 1 Compliance with Applicable Caribou Forest Plan Standards and Guidelines for Watershed and Riparian Resources

STANDARD/GUIDELINE	COMPLIANCE UNDER THE AGENCY PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE
Watershed and Riparian Resources Guideline 1: Not more than 30 percent of any of the principle watershed and/or their subwatersheds (6 th HUC) should be in a hydrologically disturbed condition at any one time. (RFP 3-16)	None of the principle watersheds and/or subwatersheds have more than 30 percent of their area in a hydrologically disturbed condition. This project would temporarily disturb a maximum of approximately 296 acres across several watersheds and would not result in disturbance exceeding 30 percent in any watershed and/or subwatershed.
Watershed and Riparian Resources Guideline 2: Proposed projects analyzed under the NEPA should adhere to the State Source Water Assessment Plan to achieve consistency with the Safe Drinking Water Act, and amendments, to emphasize the protection of surface and ground water sources used for public drinking water. (RFP 3-16)	None of the streams in the project study area are known to be used as a public drinking water source and the project would adhere to the State Source Water Assessment plan.
Watershed and Riparian Resources Guideline 3: projects in watersheds with 303(d) listed waterbodies and/or delineated Source Water Protection Areas should be supported by scale and level of analysis sufficient to permit an understanding of the implications of the project within the large watershed context. (RFP 3-16)	The project parallels Crow Creek, which is included on both Idaho's and Wyoming's 303 (d) lists for selenium-based impairment of aquatic life beneficial use standards. Section 3.3.2.2 of the FEIS addresses Crow Creek. Due to design features and Environmental Protection Measures (EPMs), including crossing via directional bore, antidegradation provisions would be met.
Watershed and Riparian Resources Guideline 3: Proposed projects analyzed under NEPA should adhere to the State Nonpoint Source Management Plan to best achieve consistency with both Sections 313 and 319 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act. (RFP 3-16)	The project would adhere to the State Nonpoint Source Management Plan through compliance with all applicable regulations to reduced nonpoint source pollution. Permits that would be obtained include a Construction General Permit for stormwater discharges from the US Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA) to comply with Section 402 of the Clean Water Act (CWA), and an analogous Large Construction General Permit (LCGP) for stormwater discharges from the Wyoming Department of Environmental Quality (WDEQ) Water Quality Division. These permits would require measures to reduce erosion and control sediment loading. Further, all Waters of the US (WOTUS) crossings where trenching is proposed would require a 404 permit from the US Army Corps of Engineers (USACE), as well as 401 certifications from the Idaho Department of Environmental Quality (IDEQ) or the WDEQ to certify that instream construction activities would comply with surface water quality standards.

2.2 Soils and Erosion

Table 2 summarizes compliance with applicable standards and guidelines from the CNF RFP (USFS 2003a) with regard to soils and erosion under the Agency Preferred Alternative.

Table 2 Compliance with Applicable Caribou Forest Plan Standards and Guidelines for Soils

STANDARD/GUIDLINE	COMPLIANCE UNDER THE PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE
Soil Standard 2: Suitability for resource management activities shall be disclosed in the site-specific analysis. (RFP 3-6).	Section 3.4 of the EIS provides a description of the various soil types encountered in the project area and their Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS) rating.
Soil Guideline 2: Maintain ground cover, microbiotic crusts, and fine organic matter that would protect the soil from erosion in excess of soil loss tolerance limits and provide nutrient cycling. (RFP 3-6).	<p>In the short-term and unless otherwise specified in areas such as wetlands and Aquatic Influence Zones (AIZs), topsoil within the area that is being trenched, would be stripped, windrowed along the edge of the right-of-way (ROW), and protected with a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) and other Best Management Practices (BMPs) until redistributed for reclamation upon completion of construction. On steep slopes, enhanced BMPs would be employed. These may include direct planting of native vegetation, diversion channels, erosion blankets or terraces to immediately stabilize the soils and prevent runoff into sensitive areas.</p> <p>To recover soil function as quickly as possible, restoration would begin as soon as construction is complete at each crossing. To encourage the success of re-growth of vegetation, reclaimed areas would be monitored annually, maintained as needed (control of invasive weeds and overseeding as necessary) and would be measured against success criteria.</p>

STANDARD/GUIDELINE	COMPLIANCE UNDER THE PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE
<p>Soil Guideline 3: Detrimental soil disturbance such as compaction, erosion, puddling, displacement, and severely burned soils caused by management practices should be limited or mitigated to meet long-term soil productivity goals. (RFP 3-6).</p>	<p>Restoration of disturbed areas would routinely include loosening of compacted soils prior to seeding. To minimize the potential for soil compaction during construction, LVE would prohibit the use of heavy equipment when soils that are wet. Further, temporary construction mats or bridges may be used, if necessary, at wetland or stream crossings to reduce soil compaction.</p> <p>On steep slopes, enhanced BMPs would be employed. These may include direct planting of native vegetation, diversion channels, erosion blankets or terraces to immediately stabilize the soils and prevent runoff into sensitive areas. To ensure the efficacy of erosion controls identified in the SWPPP, inspections would be made at least once per week and after rain events for the duration of construction. The implementation of BMPs during project construction is reinforced by ensuring that inspections would be made by qualified personnel of LVE or its contractors and that maintenance of BMPs would occur on a frequent and regular basis.</p> <p>Under a best-case scenario, it would take approximately 3 to 5 years to meet success criteria, at which time, soils would be adequately stabilized. Short-term (i.e., 10 years or less) soil stabilization is expected but the time period would be directly related to the type and intensity of the disturbance and diligent monitoring and maintenance.</p>

2.3 Recreation

Table 3 summarizes compliance with applicable standards and guidelines from the CNF RFP (USFS 2003a) with regard to recreation under the project.

Table 3 Compliance with Applicable Caribou Forest Plan Standards and Guidelines for Recreation

STANDARD/GUIDELINE	COMPLIANCE UNDER THE AGENCY PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE
<p>Recreation Guideline 3: Projects should be planned and implemented to meet the Recreation Opportunity Spectrum (ROS) as depicted on the Forest ROS map. (RFP 3-40)</p>	<p>Roads disturbed during project construction would be returned to the pre-construction conditions. Accordingly, the project would not conflict with or modify the existing ROS designations.</p>

2.4 Vegetation Resources and Noxious Weeds

Table 4 summarizes compliance with applicable standards and guidelines from the CNF RFP (USFS 2003a) with regard to vegetation resources under the project.

Table 4 Compliance with Applicable CNF RFP Standards and Guidelines for Vegetation

STANDARD/GUIDELINE	COMPLIANCE UNDER THE AGENCY PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE
<p>Vegetation Standard 2: In each 5th code HUC which has the ecological capability to produce forested vegetation, the combination of mature and old age classes (including old growth) shall be at least 20 percent of the forested acres. At least 15 percent of all the forested acres in the HUC are to meet or be actively managed to attain old-growth characteristics. (RFP 3-19)</p>	<p>The existing CNF vegetation GIS coverage in the relevant HUCs show 97% of the forested vegetation within mature or old age structural classes. All of the forested stands that would be impacted by the project are in mature/old age classes. Therefore, the project would not negatively impact the distribution of forest age classes and would be consistent with maintaining at least 20 percent mature/old age classes in the 5th code HUC that encompasses the analysis area. Because of the prevalence of mature/old aspen stands on the landscape, it is likely that at least 15 percent of the aspen forest in the watershed would still remain to be actively managed to attain old-growth characteristics under the project.</p>
<p>Vegetation Guideline 1: Manage to reduce the decline of aspen and promote aspen regeneration and establishment. Provide protection from grazing where needed and consistent with management objectives. (RFP 3-19)</p>	<p>The project would result in the permanent loss of 10.9 acres of aspen forest. This permanent loss is not expected to impact aspen on a forest-wide scale, particularly given that stands in the project area are naturally patchy. In addition, LVE would coordinate with the current permittee as needed to ensure that protection from grazing is provided.</p>
<p>Vegetation Guideline 3: For aspen and conifer types, acres classified as mature and old growth should be in blocks over 200 acres in size unless the natural patch size is smaller (a block can consist of a combination of mature and old-growth forest types). Within these blocks:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Maintain the dead and down woody material guidelines for wildlife. • Silvicultural techniques may be used to maintain or improve old-growth and mature forest characteristics. <p>If a catastrophic event (such as fire) reduces the acres of old-growth and mature forest below 20 percent of the forested acres in a principal watershed, identify replacement forested acres. When necessary, use silvicultural techniques to promote desired characteristics in the replacement acres. (RFP 3-19)</p>	<p>While the aspen forest in the project area is naturally patchy, none of the individual aspen stands surpass 200 acres in size. The project would result in a permanent loss of 14.3 acres of aspen or mixed aspen forest. This is not anticipated to significantly reduce the size of mature and old-growth areas (blocks) or the availability for wildlife habitat management.</p>

STANDARD/GUIDELINE	COMPLIANCE UNDER THE AGENCY PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE
Plant Species Diversity Standard 1: Projects and activities shall be managed to avoid adverse impacts to sensitive plant species that would result in a trend toward federal listing or loss of viability. (RFP 3-22)	There are no identified plant species listed as threatened, endangered, or proposed under the Endangered Species Act (ESA) in the project area (Section 3.7.2.2). No CNF sensitive plant species or CNF Forest Watch rare plant species have been documented in the project ROW.
Plant Species Diversity Guideline 1: Native plant species from genetically local sources should be used to the extent practical for erosion control, fire rehabilitation, riparian restoration, road rights-of-way seeding, and other revegetation projects. (RFP 3-22)	Native plant species from genetically local sources would be used to the extent practical.
Plant Species Diversity Guideline 2: Where practical, disturbed sites should be allowed to revegetate naturally where the seed source and soil conditions are favorable (e.g., low erosion potential, deeper soils) and noxious weeds are not expected to be a problem. (RFP 3-22)	Revegetation of disturbed areas would be conducted during reclamation activities by seeding and planting by an approved USFS reclamation seed mix. Revegetation would be conducted to stabilize reclaimed surfaces with plant communities and restore post-disturbance land uses of grazing and wildlife habitat.
Plant Species Diversity Guideline 3: Known occurrences or habitat for rare plants on the “Forest Watch” list and rare or unique plant communities on the Forest should be maintained. (RFP 3-22)	No CNF sensitive plant species or CNF Forest Watch, rare plant species have been documented in the project ROW. It is likely that if newly discovered populations were discovered in the project area, slight realignments could be made to completely avoid any potential direct impacts to either species.
Plant Species Diversity Guideline 4: Maintain, and where possible, increase unique or difficult-to-replace elements such as areas of high species diversity aspen, riparian areas, tall forbs, rare plant communities, etc. (RFP 3-22)	A total of 11.5 acres of riparian habitat would be lost where the route would cross creeks and drainages. The number of crossings has been minimized to the extent feasible. Some aspen communities which are high in species diversity would be removed as specified in Vegetation Guideline 3 compliance.
Plant Species Diversity Guideline 5: The Forest Botanist or Ecologist should review seed mixes used for revegetation to ensure no adverse impacts to threatened, endangered, sensitive species; other species at risk; and the overall native flora within the analysis area. (RFP 3-22)	Revegetation of disturbed areas would be conducted during reclamation activities by seeding and planting by an approved USFS reclamation seed mix.
Prescription 8.2.2 Goal 4: Emphasize the use of native plant species in reclamation but allow the use of non-natives when natives will not achieve reclamation goals. (RFP 3-22)	Agency-approved seed mixes containing native seeds would be applied.

Noxious Weeds

Table 5 summarizes applicable CNF RFP Standards and Guidelines for Noxious Weeds. The project would be in compliance with these goals/objectives/projects, standards, and guidelines by use of a native seed mix that would be applied to complement the existing plant communities and reclaimed areas and by actively controlling identified noxious weeds. Appropriate BMPs, in compliance with the goals/objectives/project, standards, and guidelines listed in **Table 5** would be implemented to control invasive and noxious species throughout the life of proposed

activities. Examples of these BMPs include treatment of identified invasive species, using state-certified noxious weed free hay/straw when needed, use of a seed mix that is certified as weed-free, and monitoring for noxious weeds. There are no extensive areas of noxious weeds infestations in the project area, and BMPs would be implemented to minimize their potential spread. Therefore, the effects of noxious weeds from the project would be short-term and minor if treated regularly.

Table 5 Compliance with Applicable CNF RFP Standards and Guidelines for Noxious Weeds

STANDARD/GUIDELINE	COMPLIANCE UNDER THE AGENCY PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE
Noxious Weeds and Invasive Species Standard 1: Only weed-free hay, straw, pellets, and mulch shall be used on the Forest. (RFP 3-21)	LVE would comply with this guideline by using only certified weed-free mulch, straw bales, etc.
Noxious Weeds and Invasive Species Standard 2: All seed used shall be certified to be free of noxious weed seeds from weeds listed on the current <i>All States Noxious Weeds List</i> . (RFP 3-21)	LVE would comply with this guideline by using only certified weed-free seed.
Noxious Weeds and Invasive Species Standard 4: Noxious weeds shall be aggressively treated throughout the Forest, unless specifically prohibited, following the Caribou Noxious Weed Strategy. Using Integrated Weed Management, methods of control, and access shall be consistent with the goals of each prescription area. (RFP 3-21)	LVE would prepare a noxious weed control and prevention program to be implemented during construction. This program would be approved by the USFS.
Noxious Weeds and Invasive Species Guideline 1: Weed treatment projects, especially those using herbicides, should be timed to achieve desired effects on target vegetation, while having minimal effects on non-target vegetation. (RFP 3-21)	LVE would prepare a noxious weed control and prevention program to be implemented during construction. This program would be approved by the USFS.
Noxious Weeds and Invasive Species Guideline 3: Monitor, as needed, disturbed areas, such as landings, skid trails, roads, mines, burned areas, etc., for noxious weeds or invasive species and treat where necessary. (RFP 3-21)	LVE would prepare a noxious weed control and prevention program to be implemented during construction. This program would be approved by the USFS.
Noxious Weeds and Invasive Species Guideline 4: Evaluate the potential for invasion by noxious weeds into proposed vegetation units and wildland fire use plan areas and modify units or mitigate where necessary. (RFP 3-21)	LVE would prepare a noxious weed control and prevention program to be implemented during construction. This program would be approved by the USFS.

2.5 Fisheries and Aquatic Resources

Table 6 summarizes compliance with the CNF RFP (USFS 2003a) with regard to applicable AIZs for the project. These would also apply to the three special status fish species known to occur in the streams crossed by the project.

Table 6 Compliance with Applicable CNF RFP Standards and Guidelines for AIZs

STANDARD/GUIDELINE	COMPLIANCE UNDER THE AGENCY PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE
AIZ, Lands Guideline 1: Avoid locating facilities and	In general, the project is designed to comply with the

STANDARD/GUIDELINE	COMPLIANCE UNDER THE AGENCY PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE
utility corridors in AIZs. (RFP 4-48)	<p>CNF RFP direction (i.e., in the placement of facilities, design of crossings, etc.). However, there would be approximately 17 acres of temporary impacts to AIZs, which includes associated riparian areas. Impacts to AIZs under the project include disturbance of riparian and upland vegetation in valley bottoms and hillside slopes and disturbance of stream channels and associated wetlands during pipeline installation.</p> <p>Placement of the utility corridor/pipeline and interactions with AIZs were accounted for during project alternative development and selection to the extent possible; however, it was impractical to avoid these areas entirely. A majority of the 49.1-mile proposed pipeline is designed to be collocated with roadways and crossings of perennial streams, limited to five fish bearing stream crossings. Some of these roadways, including the Crow Creek Road (FSR 111), are in the AIZ and contribute to the 17 acres of AIZ associated within this project. At most perennial stream crossings, the pipeline path only interacts with AIZs at discrete locations.</p> <p>AIZ disturbance was limited to a 25-foot width and crossing locations were designed to be perpendicular to streams to limit AIZ disturbance. Furthermore, measures including horizontal directional drilling would occur on fish bearing streams, including Crow, Sage, and Deer creeks, to further avoid surface disturbance in wetlands, riparian areas, and AIZs. Additional EPMs would be implemented to reduce contaminant transport throughout the project area as well as to reduce erosion and sedimentation.</p>
AIZ, General Management Standard 1: Within legal authorities, ensure that new proposed management activities within watersheds containing 303(d) listed waterbodies improve or maintain overall progress toward beneficial use attainment for pollutants which led to listing. (RFP 4-50).	The project would maintain overall progress toward beneficial use attainment for pollutants as discussed in Table 1.
AIZ General Management Guideline 1: Felled trees should remain on site when needed to meet woody debris objectives and desired AIZ attributes. (RFP 4-50)	It is unlikely that the project would fell trees within AIZs as most streams would be crossed via directional bore. Where trees do need to be removed, they would remain onsite.
AIZ General Management Guideline 3: Avoid storage of fuels and other toxicants or refueling within AIZs unless there are no other alternatives. Any refueling sites within an AIZ should have an approved spill containment plan. (RFP 4-50)	There would be no storage of fuels and other toxicants within AIZs. LVE would avoid refueling within AIZs or riparian areas. In addition, all refueling areas (including those outside of AIZs or riparian areas) would include development and implementation of a spill prevention and contingency plan.
AIZ Roads and Trails Guideline 7: Avoid making channel changes on streams and drainages. (RFP 4-51)	No channel changes would be made.

2.6 Wildlife Resources

Table 7 summarizes compliance with the CNF RFP (USFS 2003a) with regard to wildlife resources for the project. The following standards and guidelines were also reviewed but do not apply to the effects on wildlife resources:

- Dead and Down Material Guideline 1
- Snag/Cavity Nesting Habitat Standards 1 through 3 and Guidelines 1 through 5
- Big Game Guideline 3

Table 7 Compliance with Applicable CNF RFP Standards and Guidelines for Wildlife

STANDARD/GUIDELINE	COMPLIANCE UNDER THE AGENCY PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE
Big Game Guideline 1: Provide for vegetation buffers of at least one sight distance around big game concentration/use areas, such as wallows and mineral licks. Sight distance is the distance at which 90 percent of a deer or elk is hidden from an observer. This will vary depending on site specific stand conditions. (RFP 3-31)	The project would be in compliance with this guideline because no big game concentration areas, such as wallows or mineral licks, have been identified in the project area.
Big Game Guideline 2: Provide for security or travel corridors near created openings. (RFP 3-31)	Small corridor areas (< 50-foot wide) within small areas of forest would be created by the project. As a result of temporary noise and human presence during construction activities, it is likely that wildlife such as big game would avoid a larger area than the actual disturbance footprint, reducing the amount of security habitat and potentially disrupting local travel corridors in the vicinity of the project, temporarily. However, the relatively small area of disturbance of the project is not anticipated to impact security or travel corridors on a Forest-wide scale and big game are likely to displace into the abundant and adjacent undisturbed areas during construction activities and then return to the area afterwards.
Prescription 2.7.1 (d) Elk and Deer Winter Range Critical and 2.7.2 (d) Elk and Deer Winter Range, Wildlife Standard 1: Biological potential for woodpeckers shall be allowed to fluctuate with natural disturbance processes and management projects designed to maintain productive winter range. (RFP 4-42)	Yes, both elk and deer winter range occur within the project area (Stantec 2018), although some portions of the winter range to be impacted would occur immediately adjacent to existing dirt roads in the project area that provide low habitat value in these specific areas.
Prescription 8.2.2 Wildlife Guideline 3: Consider vegetation species that contribute to wildlife habitat needs when developing reclamation plans and create wildlife structures (slash piles, logs, rock piles) using native vegetation and materials to provide habitat diversity in created opening, where possible.	The project would be in compliance with this guideline as a variety of native and desirable non-native grasses, forbs, and shrubs would be used in the seed mixes for reclamation to promote post-reclamation use by wildlife. Reclamation plans do not specifically incorporate the use of wildlife structures, however; these structures may be used as appropriate in accordance with this guideline.

2.7 Special Status Wildlife

Tables 8 summarize compliance with the CNF RFP (USFS 2003a) with regard to special status wildlife for the project.

Bald Eagle

CNF RFP (2003a) contains a number of standards and guidelines for occupied nesting zones and home ranges. The project would be consistent with these standards and guidelines given that no occupied nesting zones or home ranges are known to occur in or near the project area (**Table 8**).

Table 8 Compliance with Applicable CNF RFP Standards and Guidelines for Bald Eagle

STANDARD/GUIDELINE	COMPLIANCE UNDER THE AGENCY PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE
Known nest locations?	No bald eagle nests occur within 2.5 miles of the project area; thus, the project is in compliance with RFP standards and guidelines related to bald eagle nest management (USFS 2003a).
Sensitive Species Guideline 1: Were surveys (a minimum of once prior to or during project development) of suitable habitats conducted to determine presence? Are additional surveys needed? (RFP 3-25)	No nests were observed during surveys in 2017 and 2018 (Stantec 2018). The closest known winter roost site is Crow Creek. The USFS and others have monitored the Crow Creek wintering eagle populations and the counts have ranged from 0 to 2 (USFS 2012, 2013, 2014).
Bald Eagle Habitat. Is the project area within ¼ (400m) or ½ mile (800m) (Zone I or II) from known bald eagle nests?	No
Bald Eagle Habitat Standard 3: Prohibit new structures, such as power lines, that have the potential to cause direct mortality to bald eagles. (RFP 3-27)	No new structures planned.
Bald Eagle Habitat Guideline 3: All human activities should be minimized from February 1 to August 1. (RFP 3-28)	Project activities would not occur within ½ mile of known nests.
Bald Eagle Habitat Home Range: Is the project area within 2.5-miles (Zone III) of a nest?	No
Bald Eagle Habitat Home Range Standard 2: Within a 2.5-mile radius of nest, prohibit all use of herbicides and pesticides which cause egg shell thinning as determined by EPA labeling. (RFP 3-28)	The project would not involve use of egg shell thinning chemicals.
Bald Eagle Winter Foraging Guideline 1: Activities and developments should be designed to minimize conflicts with bald eagle wintering and migration habitat. (RFP 3-28)	The project is also in compliance with the RFP guideline regarding winter foraging and roosting habitat (USFS 2003a) because activities would not occur during the winter months along Crow Creek. The project would result in the removal of potential roost trees but none near open sources of water; however, large roost trees are not a limiting factor in the area, and bald eagles would still have many roost trees available to them in this area.

Boreal Owl

The CNF RFP (USFS 2003a) contains several guidelines applicable to boreal owls (**Table 9**).

Table 9 Compliance with Applicable CNF RFP Standards and Guidelines for Boreal Owl

STANDARD/GUIDELINE	COMPLIANCE UNDER THE AGENCY PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE
Does suitable nesting habitat (tree cavities in mature fir or spruce forests with a high density of large trees [Hayward 1994]) exist in or near the project area?	Yes. Suitable nesting/foraging habitat is found in mature forest stands on the CNF (Groves et al. 1997, 134; USFS 2003a, 3-217), including within the project area.
Sensitive Species Guideline 1: Were surveys (a minimum of once prior to or during project development) of suitable habitats conducted to determine presence? Are additional surveys needed? (RFP 3-28)	Yes. No boreal owls were heard during surveys (Stantec 2018). No additional surveys are required.
Prey species (small mammals, birds, and insects) found in project area? Any impacts?	Yes. Prey base would potentially slightly decrease or be displaced with the removal of habitat within the project area.
Boreal Owl Guideline 1: Within a 3,600-acre area around all known boreal owl nest sites, maintain over 40 percent of the forested acres in mature and old age classes. Are additional surveys needed? (RFP 3-31)	This guideline would be met under the project because there are no known nest sites in the project area, and if they are discovered, the project would not impact enough forested habitat to change the distribution of forest age classes in the project area. No additional surveys are required.

Columbian sharp-tailed grouse

CNF RFP (USFS 2003a) management guidelines for Columbian sharp-tailed grouse are presented in **Table 10**.

Table 10 Compliance with Applicable CNF RFP Standards and Guidelines for Columbia Sharp-tailed Grouse

STANDARD/GUIDELINE	COMPLIANCE UNDER THE AGENCY PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE
Does suitable habitat (rangeland communities in the 12 to 20-inch precipitation zone) exist in or near the project area (Ulliman et al. 1998, p. 10)?	No. In southeast Idaho, Columbian sharp-tailed grouse are reasonably widespread in shrub and grass habitats adjacent to or in mountainous foothills (IDFG 2005). No leks have been documented on CNF system lands, although several occur adjacent to the CNF land (USFS 2003a). Elevations on the CNF are relatively high for suitable spring, summer, and fall habitat for sharp-tailed grouse. However, potential marginal habitat (mountain snowberry/sagebrush and forb/graminoid habitat) for sharp-tailed grouse would be eliminated for the short term by the project. This does not represent an appreciable decrease in sagebrush habitat within the project area.
Known records documenting presence in project area?	No. No leks have been documented on CNF system lands (USFS 2003a) and there are no known leks within 10 miles. Sharp-tailed grouse are expected to use the forest in the winter (USFS 2010). However, no winter use of this area is expected based on the lack of adjacent lekking habitat. Sharp-tailed grouse apparently do not migrate long distances between seasonal habitats (USFS 2003b: D-123, Apa 1998).
Sensitive Species Guideline 1: Were surveys (a minimum of once prior to or during project development) of suitable habitats conducted to determine presence? Are additional surveys needed? (RFP 3-28)	Given the general lack of suitable habitat, and no known or expected lek locations no surveys for sharp-tailed grouse were conducted and no grouse were observed during general baseline surveys of the area (Stantec 2018). Lek surveys are conducted on an annual basis as part of forest plan monitoring by the Idaho Department of Fish and Game (IDFG). No additional surveys are needed.
Does suitable winter habitat (chokecherry, serviceberry, and aspen) exist in or near the project area?	Yes (USFS 2010, Groves et al. 1997, Ulliman et al. 1998). Potential winter foraging habitat exists in small areas for this species (aspen) but is not expected to be occupied (see above). Further, there are numerous acres of adjacent habitat that would remain undisturbed.
Will project reduce the overall height, canopy cover, or density of key winter shrubs/trees?	Yes, small areas of aspens and mountain brush may be removed.
Columbian Sharp-tailed Grouse Standard 1: Cooperate with other state and federal agencies and private landowners to survey, inventory, and manage grouse habitats? (RFP 3-32)	Surveys: IDFG 2000, 2002, 2004a, 2004b, and 2004c. The CNF is proposing and implementing aspen treatments in various areas to increase aspen stands.

STANDARD/GUIDELINE	COMPLIANCE UNDER THE AGENCY PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE
Columbian Sharp-tailed Grouse Guideline 1: Current guidelines for sage and sharp-tailed grouse management, such as Connelly et al. (2000), should be used as a basis to develop site-specific recommendations for proposed sage brush treatments. (RFP 3-32)	This guideline is not needed and/or is not applicable to this project. There are no proposed sagebrush treatments (such as burning, chaining, etc.) associated with this project.
Columbian Sharp-tailed Grouse Guideline 2: Is project within 2 miles of known leks? (RFP 3-32)	No. No known birds nesting in project area.
Columbian Sharp-tailed Grouse Guideline 2: Management activities should consider proximity to active lek locations during site-specific project planning. Those within 10 miles of an active sage grouse lek and 2 miles of active sharp-tailed grouse leks should be considered further for suitability as grouse habitat. (RFP 3-32)	There are no known (or expected) birds nesting in or near the project area.
Columbian Sharp-tailed Grouse Guideline 3: If management activities would impact courtship, limit physical, mechanical, and audible disturbances in the breeding complex during the breeding season (March to May) within three hours of sunrise and sunset each day. (RFP 3-32)	There are no known (or expected) birds nesting in or near the project area.
Columbian Sharp-tailed Grouse Guideline 4: Where management projects will disturb nesting grouse, avoid manipulation or alteration of vegetation during the nesting period (May to June). (RFP 3-32)	There are no known (or expected) birds nesting in or near the project area.
Columbian Sharp-tailed Grouse Monitoring 1: Monitor lek attendance annually.	Since there are no known sharp-tailed grouse leks, and lekking is not expected due to a lack of suitable habitat, no annual lek monitoring occurs within the analysis area.
Columbian Sharp-tailed Grouse Monitoring 2: Monitor changes in habitat conditions from vegetation treatments 2 miles from leks.	No vegetation treatments, such as prescribed fire or thinning are associated with this project and no known leks occur within 2 miles.

Greater sage grouse

Management guidelines for greater sage grouse from the Greater Sage-grouse Draft Record of Decision and Land Management Plan Amendments for National Forest System Land in Idaho (USFS 2019) are presented in **Table 11**.

Table 11 Compliance with Applicable Standards and Guidelines from the Sage Grouse Amendment (USFS 2019)

STANDARD/GUIDELINE	COMPLIANCE UNDER THE AGENCY PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE
GRSG-GEN-ST-005-Standard: In PHMA and IHMA, do not issue new discretionary written authorizations unless all existing discrete anthropogenic disturbances cover less than 3% of the total greater sage-grouse habitat within the Biologically Significant Unit, regardless of ownership, and the new use will not cause exceedance of the 3% cap.	The project does not cross through IHMA on NFS land. The project would, however, temporarily impact approximately 38 acres of IHMA land on private and State of Idaho land. This would impact less than one percent of the block of IHMA.

STANDARD/GUIDELINE	COMPLIANCE UNDER THE AGENCY PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE
<p>GRSG-GEN-ST-006-Standard: Authorize developments in PHMA and IHMA only if the following criteria are met:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. It is determined that the project cannot be achieved, technically or economically, outside of this management area; and b. The project location and/or design should best reduce cumulative impacts and/or impacts on GRSG and other high value natural, cultural, or societal resources; this may include colocation within the footprint for existing infrastructure, to the extent practicable; and c. The project results in no net loss to GRSG Key habitat or with beneficial mitigation actions reduces habitat fragmentation or other threats within the Conservation Area; and d. The project design mitigates unavoidable impacts through appropriate compensatory mitigation (ROD, Attachment G or FEIS, Appendix C- ID Mitigation Strategy); and e. The project will not exceed the disturbance cap 	<p>The project does not cross through IHMA on NFS land. Where it crosses IHMA on private and State of Idaho Land is unavoidable due to the need to tap into the Williams pipeline. However, this location best reduces impacts because the impacts would occur at the edge of the mapped IHMA and impacts would be short term as reclamation would occur soon after the disturbance. In addition, the GRSG Conversation Measures for activities on State of Idaho endowment trust lands (IDL 2015) would be implemented within the IHMA to mitigate impacts. Lastly, the area disturbed is less than one percent of the block of IHMA (i.e., would not exceed the disturbance cap).</p>
<p>GRSG-GEN-ST-008-Standard: In PHMA and IHMA, do not authorize new infrastructure or facilities that create sustained noise levels of >10 dB above ambient baseline at the perimeter of an occupied lek during lekking (from March 15 to May 1) from 6 p.m. to 9 a.m.</p>	<p>The project does not cross through IHMA on NFS land. Where it crosses IHMA on private and State of Idaho Land the GRSG Conversation Measures for activities on State of Idaho endowment trust lands (IDL 2015) would be implemented within the IHMA to mitigate impacts. This includes avoiding project activities within 1 km (0.62 mile) of occupied leks between 6 p.m. and 9 a.m. to avoid disturbance to lekking and roosting sage-grouse, as well as limiting noise levels to not less than 10 decibels above ambient sound levels at occupied leks from two hours before sunset to two hours after sunrise during breeding season.</p>
<p>GRSG-GEN-GL-010-Guideline: During breeding and nesting (from March 15 to June 15), surface disturbing and disruptive activities to nesting birds should be avoided.</p>	<p>The project does not cross through IHMA on NFS land. Where it crosses IHMA on private and State of Idaho Land the GRSG Conversation Measures for activities on State of Idaho endowment trust lands (IDL 2015) would be implemented within the IHMA to mitigate impacts. This includes avoiding project activities within 1 km (0.62 mile) of occupied leks between 6 p.m. and 9 a.m. to avoid disturbance to lekking and roosting sage-grouse.</p>

STANDARD/GUIDELINE	COMPLIANCE UNDER THE AGENCY PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE
<p>GRSG-GEN-GL-011-Guideline: Development of tall structures with the potential to disrupt breeding or nesting by creating new perching/nesting opportunities for avian predators or by decreasing the use of an area should be restricted: 2 miles in priority habitat management areas; 2 miles (communication/metrological), 1.2 miles (transmission lines) and 0.6 miles (distribution lines) in important habitat management areas; and 0.6 miles in general habitat management areas from the perimeter of occupied leks. Local conditions (e.g. vegetation or topography), should be used to determine the potential to disrupt breeding or nesting by greater sage-grouse.</p>	<p>The project does not include above ground structures other than the small flexible line markers which do not provide perching/nesting opportunities.</p>
<p>GRSG-LR-SUA-ST-015-Standard: In PHMA and IHMA, do not authorize new lands special-uses for infrastructure, such as high-voltage transmission lines, major pipelines, distribution lines, and communication tower sites unless in compliance with GRSG-GEN-ST-006-Standard</p>	<p>See discussion for GRSG-GEN-ST-006-Standard.</p>
<p>GRSG-LR-SUA-ST-016-Standard: Lands special-use authorizations in PHMA must meet the following project screening criteria:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. The population trend for the GRSG within the associated Conservation Area is stable or increasing over a three-year period and the population levels are not currently engaging the adaptive management triggers (this applies strictly to new authorizations; renewals and amendments of existing authorizations will not be subject to these criteria when it can be shown that long-term impacts from those renewals or amendments will be substantially the same as the existing development); b. The development with associated mitigation will not result in a net loss of GRSG Key habitat or of the respective PHMA; c. The project and associated impacts will not result in a net loss of GRSG Key habitat or habitat fragmentation or other impacts causing a decline in the population of the species within the relevant Conservation Area; d. The development cannot be reasonably accomplished outside of the PHMA; or can be either: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1) developed pursuant to an existing authorization; or 2) is co-located within the footprint of existing infrastructure 	<p>The project would not occur within PHMA.</p>
<p>GRSG-LR-SUA-GL-017-Guideline: In GHMA, new lands special-use authorizations may be issued for infrastructure, such as high-voltage transmission lines, major pipelines, distribution lines, and communication tower sites, within existing designated corridors or rights-of-way or if the authorization includes stipulations to minimize impacts to the GRSG and its habitat.</p>	<p>Where the project crosses IHMA on private and State of Idaho Land the GRSG Conversation Measures for activities on State of Idaho endowment trust lands (IDL 2015) would be implemented to mitigate impacts.</p>

STANDARD/GUIDELINE	COMPLIANCE UNDER THE AGENCY PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE
GRSG-LR-SUA-ST-018-Standard: In PHMA, do not authorize temporary lands special-uses (i.e., facilities or activities) that result in loss of habitat or would have long-term (i.e., greater than 5 years) negative impact on the greater sage-grouse or its habitat. In IHMA only authorize temporary lands special-uses if habitat loss is offset by avoidance, minimization, or using compensatory mitigation.	This project does not occur in PHMA. Where it crosses IHMA on private and State of Idaho Land the GRSG Conversation Measures for activities on State of Idaho endowment trust lands (IDL 2015) would be implemented to minimize impacts.
GRSG-LR-SUA-ST-019-Standard: In PHMA and IHMA, require appropriate protective stipulations (e.g., noise, tall structure, guy wire marking) when issuing new authorizations or during renewal, amendment, or reissuance of existing authorizations that authorize infrastructure (e.g., high- voltage transmission lines, major pipelines, roads, distribution lines, and communication tower sites).	Where the project crosses IHMA on private and State of Idaho Land, protective stipulations would be included as part of implementing the GRSG Conversation Measures for activities on State of Idaho endowment trust lands (IDL 2015).
GRSG-LR-SUA-ST-020-Standard: In PHMA and IHMA, locate upgrades to existing transmission lines within the existing designated corridors or rights-of-way unless an alternate route would benefit the greater sage-grouse or its habitat.	NA – The project does not involve upgrades to a transmission line.
GRSG-LR-SUA-ST-021-Standard: In PHMA, IHMA, and GHMA, when a lands special-use authorization is revoked or terminated, and no future use is contemplated, require the authorization holder to remove overhead lines and other infrastructure in compliance with 36 CFR 251.60(i).	The project does not involve overhead lines or similar infrastructure that would require removal.

Flammulated Owl

The CNF RFP (USFS 2003a) contains several guidelines specific to flammulated owls (**Table 12**).

Table 12 Compliance with Applicable CNF RFP Standards and Guidelines for Flammulated Owl

STANDARD/GUIDELINE	COMPLIANCE UNDER THE AGENCY PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE
Does suitable nesting habitat (18" dbh snag in mature ponderosa pine & Douglas-fir forests with open canopies (30-60% [Hayward 1994]) exist in/near the project area?	Yes. Suitable nesting and foraging habitat is found in mature forests stands on the CNF (USFS 2003a and Groves et al. 1997).
Sensitive Species Guideline 1: Were surveys (a minimum of once prior to or during project development) of suitable habitats conducted to determine presence? Are additional surveys needed? (RFP 3-25)	Yes. Call responses were heard near Preuss Creek during surveys conducted in 2018. No nests were located (Stantec 2018). No additional surveys are needed.
Flammulated Owl Guideline 1: Do not allow timber harvest activities within a 30-acre area around all known flammulated owl nest sites. (RFP 3-31)	No nests are known to occur in the project area. This guideline would be met under the project because there are no known nest sites in the project area.

STANDARD/GUIDELINE	COMPLIANCE UNDER THE AGENCY PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE
Will prey species be improved or maintained with this project?	Suitable prey species for flammulated owls would also likely be displaced from the areas to be disturbed. See Townsend's big-eared bat discussion above for detailed information on long-term loss of moth habitat.

Great Gray Owl

The CNF RFP (USFS 2003a) contains the following guidelines (**Table 13**) specific to great gray owl habitat.

Table 13 Compliance with Applicable CNF RFP Standards and Guidelines for Great Gray Owl

STANDARD/GUIDELINE	COMPLIANCE UNDER THE AGENCY PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE
Does suitable nesting habitat (abandoned raptor nests or on the top of snags in mature lodgepole pine or subalpine fir forests bordering small openings or meadows [Hayward 1994]) exist in or near the project area?	Yes. Suitable nesting and foraging habitat is found in mature forests stands on the CNF (Groves et al. 1997). The project would eliminate small areas of forest habitat for the long term.
Sensitive Species Guideline 1: Were surveys (a minimum of once prior to or during project development) of suitable habitats conducted to determine presence? Are additional surveys needed? (RFP 3-25)	Great gray owls have not been found during surveys within the project area; however, one juvenile was observed near the project area (Stantec 2018). No.
Great Gray Owl Guideline 1: Within a 1,600-acre area around all known great gray owl nest sites, maintain over 40% of the forested acres in mature and old age classes. (RFP 3-31)	The project would be consistent with the guideline regarding nest sites. No nests were found during surveys (Stantec 2018).
Great Gray Owl Guideline 1: Is the use of strychnine poison used to control pocket gophers within a ½ -mile buffer around all active great gray owl nests sites restricted? (RFP 3-31)	No strychnine use would occur for this project.
Prey species (voles, mice etc. found along edges of forest clearings) found in project area? Any impacts?	Yes. The project would remove forest and upland vegetation used by small mammals. The project would eliminate forest habitat for the long term.

Northern goshawk

The CNF RFP (USFS 2003a) provides standards and guidelines for management of forest habitat within active and historical northern goshawk nesting territories. Management standards and guidelines for nest areas (within 200 acres of the nest) and post-fledging family areas (within 400 acres of the nest), as described in the CNF RFP (2003a), would be followed from September to March during ground-disturbing activities, if a nest was discovered. **Table 14** details the standards and guidelines.

Table 14 Compliance with Applicable CNF RFP Standards and Guidelines for Northern Goshawk

STANDARD/GUIDELINE	COMPLIANCE UNDER THE AGENCY PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE
Management Indicator Species Standard 1: Does suitable nesting habitat [mature forested habitat with high canopy closure and open understories] exist in or near the project area?	Yes. Suitable nesting and foraging habitat is found in mature forests stands in or near the project area (Groves et al. 1997, 80; USFS 2003a 3-219; Trec 2005; McDaniel 2006, 2007, 2008).
Is occurrence expected in or near the project area?	Yes, the project area and surrounding area contains suitable habitat.
Sensitive Species Guideline 1: Were surveys (a minimum of once prior to or during project development) of suitable habitats conducted to determine presence? Are additional surveys needed? (RFP 3-25)	The project area contains suitable habitat and goshawks may use the area year-round. During surveys in 2018, no goshawks were located (Stantec 2018). No additional surveys are needed.
Goshawk Monitoring 1: Goshawk Nest monitoring:	Nest monitoring has occurred on the CNF since 2000, a summary of results is displayed below.
<i>C-T NF Monitoring Reports: (USFS 2000, 88). Targhee NF & Caribou NF 1997 – 1999</i>	Caribou: In 1997, 14 (28%) were surveyed. Four were found to be active and 10 were inactive.
C-T NF Monitoring Reports: (USFS 2001, 14) Targhee NF & Caribou NF 2000 – 2001	C-T NF: The percent of known territories that are occupied remains low (31%). This is down from the 80% occupancy rate in the early 1990's.
C-T NF CNF RFP FEIS: (USFS 2003a D-126-127).	On the Targhee NF, more than half of the goshawk nests were in managed forest stands. Population trend is down but for several reasons.
C-T NF Monitoring Reports: (USFS 2003c, 13) Caribou NF 2002 – 2003	In 2003, one known nest successfully fledged two young.
C-T NF Monitoring Reports: (USFS 2006b, 97 – 105) Targhee NF 1997 – 2004	No goshawk territory has been active every year; not all are productive; and alternate nests are difficult to monitor; habitat does not appear to be a limiting factor. Summary below consists of: # of occupied territories, # of fledglings produced, # of territories monitored, and the % of successful territories.
C-T NF Goshawk Monitoring Reports: (Trek 2005) Summary of the 2004 results on the C-T NF	Targhee: 2 occupied, 4 fledglings/17 territories 12% Caribou: 9 occupied, 16 fledglings/25 territories 32%
C-T NF Goshawk Monitoring Reports: (McDaniel 2006) Summary of the 2005 results on the C-T NF	Targhee: 3 occupied, 3 fledglings/16 territories 6% Caribou: 4 occupied, 4 fledglings/16 territories 19%
C-T NF Goshawk Monitoring Reports: (McDaniel 2007)	Targhee: 6 occupied, 11 fledglings/16 territories 31%

Summary of the 2006 results on the C-T NF	Caribou: 4 occupied, 3 fledglings/16 territories 19%
C-T NF Goshawk Monitoring Reports: (McDaniel 2008) Summary of the 2007 results on the C-T NF	Targhee: 4 occupied, 5 fledglings/16 territories 13% Caribou: 8 occupied, 12 fledglings/16 territories 44%
C-T NF Goshawk Monitoring Reports: (Dobrich 2008) Summary of the 2008 results on the C-T NF	Targhee: 6 occupied, 3 fledglings/16 territories 13% Caribou: 6 occupied, 4 fledglings/17 territories 12%
C-T NF Goshawk Monitoring Reports: (Dobrich 2009) Summary of the 2009 results on the C-T NF	Targhee: 8 occupied, 12 fledglings/16 territories 38% Caribou: 6 occupied, 11 fledglings/16 territories 23%
C-T NF Goshawk Monitoring Reports: (Dobrich 2010) Summary of the 2010 results on the C-T NF	Targhee: 8 occupied, 10 fledglings/16 territories 33% Caribou: 5 occupied, 11 fledglings/16 territories 31%
C-T NF Goshawk Monitoring Reports: (Dobrich 2011) Summary of the 2011 results on the C-T NF	Targhee: 4 occupied, 2 fledglings/16 territories 6% Caribou: 5 occupied, 4 fledglings/ 16 territories 34%
C-T NF Goshawk Monitoring Reports: (Dobrich 2012) Summary of the 2012 results on the C-T NF	Targhee: 5 occupied, 12 fledglings/ 16 territories 31% Caribou: 7 occupied, 11 fledglings/ 16 territories 24%
C-T NF Goshawk Monitoring Report: (Ovard 2014) Summary of the 2013 results on the C-T NF	Targhee: No monitoring conducted in 2013 Caribou: 4 occupied, 5 fledglings/ 15 territories 20%
No Goshawk nest monitoring occurred on the Caribou in 2014.	NA
C-T NF Goshawk Monitoring Report: (Yorganson 2015) Summary of the 2015 results on the C-T NF	Targhee: No monitoring conducted in 2015 Caribou: 8 occupied, 11 fledglings/ 16 territories 37%
Goshawk Standard and Guideline 1: Are CNF RFP Standard / Guidelines on page 3-30 (Table 3.5) being met?	Yes, since standards and guidelines for the northern goshawk only apply to areas within active and historical nesting territories and there are no known nests within the project area, current standards and guidelines related to forest habitats are not applicable for this project.
Goshawk Standard and Guideline 1: Are restrictions on management activities (September to March) needed within a Nest area or Post-Fledging Family area? <i>Management activities area defined as mechanical treatments and road building</i>	No mechanical vegetation treatments or road building will occur with this project. Therefore, the September – March management season does not apply to this project.
Any created openings with this project?	This project will not create any openings (like would potentially occur under a timber sale or other large-scale vegetation management project). This project will not create any openings □ 40 acres.

Does this project have the potential to impact Downed Logs (average/acre)?	No.
Any vegetation thinning associated with this project?	No.
Prey species (birds/mammals within forest canopy) found in project area? Any impacts (Graham et al. 1999, 7-9)? Would prey be available for goshawks (and all raptors including great gray and boreal owls)?	<p>Yes. The project would eliminate small areas of forest habitat for the long term.</p> <p>Yes. Outside the disturbance area forest age class guidelines are met providing a diversity of forest vegetation, which is expected to maintain and/or increase available prey.</p> <p>However, forest, riparian and upland habitat and associated prey species would be lost from the project in the short term until the site is reclaimed.</p>

Peregrine falcon

The CNF RFP (USFS 2003a) contains the following standard and guideline specific to peregrine falcon habitat (**Table 15**).

Table 15 Compliance with Applicable CNF RFP Standards and Guidelines for Peregrine Falcon

STANDARD/GUIDELINE	COMPLIANCE UNDER THE AGENCY PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE
Peregrine Falcon Guideline 1: Does suitable habitat (suitable nesting cliffs near bodies of water) exist within 2 miles of the project area? Where are the closest locations of known eyries? (RFP 3-29)	No. There are historical, but currently unoccupied, nesting cliffs, as well as other potentially suitable nesting cliffs on the CNF. As numbers of peregrine falcons increase in Idaho, some of these cliffs may become occupied. There is no suitable habitat for peregrine falcons in the project area (Stantec 2018). The closest known peregrine falcon nests occur approximately 15 miles away from the project area (Grays Lake, Grays Ridge, Soda Springs), well outside the project area, thus the project would comply with RFP standards and guidelines for this species (USFS 2003a). Because project-related activities would be well more than 2 miles away from known eyries, timing restrictions or other measures would not be needed to limit human disturbance to peregrine falcons.
Known records documenting presence in project area?	Yes. Peregrine falcons have been observed in the region of the project area, but no falcons were observed during surveys in the project area in 2017 or 2018 (Stantec 2018). No nesting habitat is present.
Sensitive Species Guideline 1: Were surveys (a minimum of once prior to or during project development) of suitable habitats conducted to determine presence? Are additional surveys needed? (RFP 3-25)	No. No suitable habitat found in the project area, nearest known nests are >20 miles away. No.
Is occurrence expected in project area?	Yes. The project is not near known eyries; however, occasional foraging is possible (USFS 2003a).

STANDARD/GUIDELINE	COMPLIANCE UNDER THE AGENCY PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE
Peregrine Falcon Standard 1: Within 15 miles of all known nest sites, prohibit all use of herbicides and pesticides which cause egg shell thinning as determined by risk assessment. (RFP 3-29)	No. project is not near known nests.
Peregrine Falcon Guideline 1: For proposed projects within two miles of known peregrine falcon nests, minimize such items as: (1) human activities (rock climbing, aircraft, ground and water transportation, high noise levels and permanent facilities) which could cause disturbance to nesting pairs and young during the nesting period March 15 and July 31; (2) activities or habitat alternations which could adversely affect prey availability. (RFP 3-29)	No. The project is not near known nests.

Trumpeter swan

The CNF RFP (USFS 2003a) provides one standard for trumpeter swan nesting habitat (**Table 16**).

Table 16 Compliance with Applicable CNF RFP Standards and Guidelines for Trumpeter Swan

STANDARD/GUIDELINE	COMPLIANCE UNDER THE AGENCY PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE
Does suitable habitat for Trumpeter Swans exist in or near the project area?	No. There are typically 100 adult birds in southeast and south-central Idaho during the breeding season. They may nest at or near Grays Lake (over 20 miles northwest), Soda Springs (over 20 miles west), or Bear Lake National Wildlife Refuge 10 miles south.
Sensitive Species Guideline 1: Were surveys (a minimum of once prior to or during project development) of suitable habitats conducted to determine presence? Are additional surveys needed? (RFP 3-25)	The project area does not contain suitable breeding habitat. Trumpeter swans were not observed in the project area during baseline surveys conducted in 2017 or in 2018 (Stantec 2018).
Known records documenting presence in project area? CNF is in the southwest corner of the tri-state area of the Rocky Mountain Population.	CNF is in the southwest corner of the tri-state area of the Rocky Mountain Population. There is no suitable breeding habitat on NFS land within the project area.
Is occurrence or nesting expected in project area?	Occurrence: None Nesting: No – no suitable habitat.
Trumpeter Swan Standard 1: Maintain suitable trumpeter swan nesting habitat conditions in Elk Valley Marsh and other sites. (RFP 3-31)	The project does not occur in or near the Elk Valley Marsh.
Trumpeter Swan Guideline 1: Change livestock grazing through management or fencing when grazing is adversely affecting trumpeter swan use or productivity. (RFP 3-31)	The project does not occur in or near the Elk Valley Marsh.

Migratory Birds

Table 17 summarizes compliance with the CNF RFP with regard to migratory birds for the project.

Table 17 Compliance with Applicable CNF RFP Standards and Guidelines for Migratory Birds

STANDARD/GUIDELINE	COMPLIANCE UNDER THE AGENCY PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE
Landbirds Guideline 1: Stands of mature trees (including snags and dead-topped trees) should be maintained next to wet meadows. (RFP 3-33)	There is the potential that small patches of mature trees immediately adjacent to small wetland areas could be impacted within a 50-foot wide construction corridor by the project, although large stands of mature trees should not be impacted.
Landbirds Guideline 2: Where feasible, maintain 30 to 50 percent of the sagebrush habitat in a 5th code HUC in contiguous blocks greater than 320 acres to support sagebrush obligate species. (RFP 3-33)	The project would be consistent with this guideline because it would not reduce any contiguous blocks of big sagebrush habitat to less than 320 acres.
Landbirds Guideline 3: Practices which stabilize or increase native grass and forbs cover in sagebrush habitats with 5% to 25% sagebrush canopy cover should be implemented. (RFP 3-33)	The project would be consistent with this guideline over the long term (though up to approximately 212 acres (92 acres on USFS land) of sagebrush habitat could be removed during the project. A variety of native and desirable non-native grass and forb species are included in the seed mix that would be used for restoration/reclamation activities following construction.
Landbirds Guideline 4: In sagebrush habitats, manage herbaceous cover to conceal nests through the first incubation period for ground and low shrub-nesting birds. (RFP 3-33)	The project would be consistent with this guideline over the long term (though up to approximately 212 acres (92 acres on USFS land) of sagebrush habitat could be removed in the short term). Following successful restoration/reclamation activities, originally disturbed areas are predicted to provide herbaceous and grass cover that would allow for concealment of ground and low-shrub nests.

Gray wolf

The CNF RFP includes the following management guidance (**Table 18**) for gray wolves.

Table 18 Compliance with Applicable CNF RFP Standards and Guidelines for Gray Wolves

STANDARD/GUIDELINE	COMPLIANCE UNDER THE AGENCY PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE
Gray Wolf Standard 1: Restrict intrusive human disturbances (motorized access, vegetation management, livestock grazing, etc.) within one mile around active den sites and rendezvous sites between April 1 and June 30 when there are five or fewer breeding pairs of wolves in the Yellowstone Nonessential Experimental Population Area (applies to the portion of the Forest east of Interstate 15) or the Central Idaho Nonessential Experimental Population Area (applies to the portion of the Forest west of Interstate 15). After six or more breeding pairs become established in each experimental population area, land use restrictions will not be necessary. (RFP 3-29)	There are no known wolf dens or rendezvous sites within 1 mile of the project area. The closest known packs are the Dog Creek Pack (#134) pack in Wyoming and Pine Creek Pack (#282) in Idaho, both approximately 35-40 miles north of the project area (USFWS et al. 2016). The project is in compliance with RFP standards that restrict human disturbances within one mile of such areas.
Gray Wolf Standard 2: If and when wolves are de-listed, they will be managed in accordance with approved state management plans. (RFP 3-29)	Wolves in Idaho were delisted on May 5, 2011 and are managed by the Idaho Department of Fish and Game.

Canada lynx

Compliance with applicable USFS for Canada lynx is summarized in **Table 19**. In addition, the following management direction was reviewed and found to not be applicable to the project:

- CNF RFP (USFS 2003a) Lands Objective 1 and Lands Standard 1

Note that LVE, where appropriate, will reference the 2013 Canada Lynx Conservation Assessment Strategy as best available science when implementing measures per the RFP.

Table 19 Compliance with USFS Management Directions for Canada Lynx

STANDARD/GUIDELINE	COMPLIANCE UNDER THE AGENCY PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE
Forest Vegetation DFC-1: Forested habitats display a diversity of structure and composition. Productive and diverse populations of plants are maintained or restored. (RFP 3-28)	The project would not hinder attainment of or progress toward this Desired Future Condition (DFC). There would be an estimated removal of 17.2 acres of forested habitat. On a forest-wide scale, this is minor and insignificant, amounting to only 0.003 percent of the total 550,000 acres of forest habitat available in the CNF (USFS 2003).
Forest Vegetation DFC 2: In conifers, a range of structural stages exists where 30 to 40 percent of the acres are in mature and old age classes. Early successional stages are maintained through endemic insect and disease disturbance, vegetation management and fire. Patterns are within historical ranges of variability with functional corridors present. (RFP 3-28)	The project would not hinder this DFC.

STANDARD/GUIDELINE	COMPLIANCE UNDER THE AGENCY PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE
Forest Vegetation DFC 3: Conifer types are maintained and disturbance processes are restored through vegetation management, endemic insect / disease disturbances, & fire. (RFP 3-28)	The project would not hinder attainment of or progress towards this DFC.
Forest Vegetation DFC 4: Quaking aspen communities are moving towards historical ranges with fire and other practices influencing structural class distribution and patterns across the landscape. Aspen forests are managed to achieve desired vegetative conditions with 20 to 30 percent in mature and old age classes, and to reduce the decline of aspen acres as a result of succession of aspen to conifer. (RFP 3-28)	The project would not hinder attainment of or progress towards this DFC. Impacts to aspen communities would be minor (10.9 acres). Currently, 93 percent of the aspen stands in the 5th code HUC are in old/mature age classes based on USFS mapping. All of the aspen stands that would be impacted under the project are in mature/old age classes.
Non-forest DFC-1: Non-forested ecosystems: are resilient, diverse, and functioning within their site potential; display a diversity of structure and composition; and are within their historical range of variability (HRV). (RFP 3-28)	The project would not hinder attainment of or progress towards this DFC. Impacts to non-forested ecosystems would largely be temporary, and they would be reclaimed with a variety of native plant species.
Non-forest DFC-2: Non-forested ecosystems reflect a mosaic of multiple-aged shrubs, forbs, and native grasses with management emphasis on maintaining a diverse sustainable plant community. Fire regimes exist on an approximate 20 to 40-year return cycle. Patterns are within historical ranges with 30 to 50 percent of the shrubs in greater than fifteen percent canopy cover class. (RFP 3-28)	The project would not hinder attainment of or progress towards this DFC. Impacts to non-forested ecosystems would largely be temporary, and they would be reclaimed with a variety of native plant species.
Non-forest DFC-3: Rehabilitation or restoration of native shrub communities is accomplished, where site potential permits. (RFP 3-28)	The project would not hinder attainment of or progress towards this DFC.
Non-forest DFC-4: On areas capable of tall forb dominance, tall forb types reflect historical ranges of ground cover leading into the winter season. Composition reflects a mosaic dominance of tall forb indicator species. Disturbance regimes demonstrate stable or upward trend in tall forb indicator species. Patterns are within the historical range. Historical tall forb sites, which currently are not capable of tall forb dominance, are managed to maintain watershed stability. (RFP 3-28)	The project would not hinder attainment of or progress towards this DFC as areas capable of tall forbs would re-establish in reclaimed areas from surrounding habitats.
Non-forest DFC-5: Woodland types including mountain mahogany, juniper and maple have multiple-aged shrub layers and a balanced shrub/herbaceous understory. Patterns are within historical ranges. (RFP 3-28)	The project would not hinder attainment of or progress towards this DFC.
Vegetation Goal 1: Diverse forested and non-forested ecosystems are maintained within their historic range of variability or restored through time with emphasis on aspen, aspen-conifer, mixed conifer, big sagebrush, mountain brush and tall forbs. (RFP 3-28)	Short-term impacts from the project would not be consistent with this goal; however, after reclamation activities were completed and the site had recovered to high-elevation rangeland habitat (110 years), the goal would be met.

STANDARD/GUIDELINE	COMPLIANCE UNDER THE AGENCY PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE
Vegetation Goal 2: Aspen forests are managed to reduce or halt the decline of aspen acres as a result of succession of aspen to conifer. (RFP 3-28)	The project would be inconsistent with this goal, as it would permanently remove 10.9 acres of aspen. However, lost aspen habitat would be expected to return to high-elevation rangeland (not conifer habitat), which over time and through succession could eventually return to aspen habitat.
Vegetation Goal 3: Forested ecosystems are moving towards a balance of age and size classes in each forested vegetation type on a watershed or landscape scale. Early seral species are recruited and sustained while still providing a diversity of successional stages. (RFP 3-28)	The project would be consistent with the attainment of or progress towards this goal. The removal of 17.2 acres of forest habitat would not impact the distribution of forest stand age classes on the CNF or at the landscape scale. Currently, 93 percent of the aspen stands in the 5th code HUC are in old/mature age classes based on USFS mapping. All of the aspen stands that would be impacted by the project are in mature/old age classes. Therefore, the project would not negatively impact the distribution of aspen forest age classes and would be consistent with maintaining at least 20 percent mature/old age classes in the 5th code HUC that encompasses the project area.
Vegetation Goal 4: Sagebrush steppe and mountain shrub habitats are moving toward a balance of age, canopy cover, and size class on a watershed or landscape scale that is within their HRV. (RFP 3-28)	The project would be consistent with attainment of or progress towards this goal after reclamation activities were completed and the site had recovered to big sagebrush and high-elevation rangeland habitat types.
Vegetation Goal 7: Biodiversity is maintained or enhanced by managing for a diverse array of habitats tied to natural process occurrence and distribution of plant communities. (RFP 3-28)	The project would be consistent with attainment of or progress towards this goal. Habitat changes resulting from the project would be localized to the footprint. Maintenance of existing biodiversity on the CNF is expected.
Vegetation Standard 2: In each 5th code HUC which has the ecological capability to produce forested vegetation, the combination of mature and old age classes (including old growth) shall be at least 20 percent of the forested acres. At least 15 percent of all the forested acres in the HUC are to meet or be actively managed to attain old growth characteristics. (RFP 3-28)	The project would be consistent with this standard. Currently, 93 percent of the aspen stands in the 5th code HUC are in old/mature age classes based on USFS mapping. All of the aspen stands that would be impacted by the project are in mature/old age classes. Therefore, the project would not negatively impact the distribution of aspen forest age classes and would be consistent with maintaining at least 20 percent mature/old age classes in the 5th code HUC.
Wildlife Goal 2: Wildlife biodiversity is maintained or enhanced by managing for vegetation and plant communities within their historical range of variability. (RFP 3-28)	The project would be consistent with attainment of or progress towards this goal. Habitat changes resulting from the project would be localized to the footprint. Maintenance of existing wildlife biodiversity on the CNF is expected.
Wildlife Goal 3: Maintain multiple vegetation layers in woody riparian habitats that are stable or increasing with all age classes (seedlings, young plants, mature and decadent) represented to support native bird communities and other wildlife. (RFP 3-28)	The project would be consistent with this goal as impacts to riparian areas have been minimized.

STANDARD/GUIDELINE	COMPLIANCE UNDER THE AGENCY PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE
Wildlife Goal 5: Maintain, and where necessary and feasible, provide for habitat connectivity across forested and non-forested landscapes. (RFP 3-28)	While localized impacts to habitat connectivity would occur during project implementation, the revegetation and reclamation efforts would be expected to help maintain large scale habitat connectivity in the long-term. Over the short term, pipeline would fragment some of the habitats in the project area.

Townsend's big-eared bat

The CNF RFP (USFS 2003a) includes the following guideline (**Table 20**) for sensitive bat species.

Table 20 Compliance with Applicable CNF RFP Standards and Guidelines for Townsend's Big-eared Bat

STANDARD/GUIDELINE	COMPLIANCE UNDER THE AGENCY PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE
Does suitable maternity and hibernation habitat exist in or near the project area? (Groves et al. 1997, 285)	No. Past surveys within the CNF have found Townsend's big-eared bats in the Bear River Range, Pruess Range, Portneuf Range, and Elkhorn Mountains (USFS 2003c). Surveys conducted in the Montpelier Ranger District found five mines and caves with low numbers of Townsend's big-eared bats during the summer and 11 mines and caves with low numbers during the winter (USFS 2003c). However, no suitable maternity or hibernacula habitat is present in the project area as the project area does not contain caves (Stantec 2018).
Does suitable night roosting habitat (buildings, bridges, and tree cavities) exist in or near the project area?	Yes. Snags in the project area are suitable for roosting and big-eared bats may forage or roost in the project area during spring, summer, or fall.
Sensitive Species Guideline 1: Were surveys (a minimum of once prior to or during project development) of suitable habitats conducted to determine presence? Are additional surveys needed? (RFP 3-25)	Yes. No detections occurred during the surveys 2017 (Stantec 2018). No.
Any detrimental human disturbance of hibernation sites?	No. No disturbance to mines or caves.
Any detrimental human disturbance of roost sites?	Yes. Some snags in the project area would likely be removed.
Prey species and habitat in project area? Shrubs, trees, and flowering plants are important for <i>lepidopteran</i> (moth) reproduction. Specifically, riparian vegetation (willows and cattails) is considered important for <i>C. townsendii</i> as a substrate for noctuid moth reproduction. It follows that in regions where these host plant species have been lost or reduced, that the prey base has also been reduced for <i>C. townsendii</i> (Pierson et al. 1999, 25; Miller et al. 2005, 47; WBWG 2005). Any impacts?	Yes. Due to the wide variety of suitable moth habitat that would remain outside the project area, moth populations would remain available as a prey source. Prey species' habitat may be eliminated temporarily and disturbed within the actual areas of disturbance. Also, the availability of prey (moths) would not be impacted by pesticides (which would not be used with this project).

STANDARD/GUIDELINE	COMPLIANCE UNDER THE AGENCY PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE
Will grazing promote the maintenance of natural insect population levels and diversity (Miller et al. 2005, 17)?	N/A; livestock utilization standards and guidelines are being met (see range analysis in EIS document for this area).
Caves Standard 1: Retain vegetation in the vicinity of a cave or cave course if it is required to protect the cave's microenvironment (habitat, climate, vegetation, etc). (RFP 3-5)	No. No caves or mines were found or expected to occur in the project area.
Caves Guideline 1: Will any cave entrances be gated with this project? "Gating of cave entrances may be allowed as long as the entrance maintains natural airflow patterns". (RFP 3-5)	No. No caves or mines were found or expected to occur in the project area.
Caves Guideline 2: Management activities may be permitted within any area draining into or away from a cave if they are not likely to adversely affect the cave ecosystem. (RFP 3-5)	No. No caves or mines were found or expected to occur in the project area.
Bats Guideline 4: Are mines or caves being closed with this project? (RFP 3-32)	No. No caves or mines were found or expected to occur in the project area.
Bats Guideline 1: All abandoned underground mines should be evaluated as bat habitat prior to closure. As an alternative to collapsing mine entrances, gate abandoned mines to retain roosting and hibernation habitat for bats. (RFP 3-32)	No caves or mines were found or expected to occur in the project area.
Bats Guideline 2: Gating of mines should be considered where human disturbance is disturbing/displacing bats. Where gates are used, they should be designed in accordance with published literature. (RFP 3-32)	No caves or mines were found or expected to occur in the project area.
Bats Guideline 3: Discourage or restrict entry to mines and caves known to be occupied by hibernating bats or bats with young. Exceptions include surveys conducted by qualified personnel. (RFP 3-32)	No caves or mines were found or expected to occur in the project area.

North American Wolverine

Compliance with applicable USFS management directions for North American wolverine is summarized in **Table 21**.

Table 21 USFS Management Direction for the North American Wolverine

STANDARD/GUIDELINE	COMPLIANCE UNDER THE AGENCY PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE
Does suitable denning habitat occur in the project area?	No, the project area does not contain the elements required for wolverine denning (e.g. above 8,200 feet elevation, north-facing boulder talus slopes, etc.).
Sensitive Species Guideline 1: Were surveys (a minimum of once prior to or during project development) of suitable habitats conducted to determine presence? Are additional surveys needed? (RFP 3-25)	Yes. No wolverine tracks were found during winter tracking surveys (Stantec 2018).

STANDARD/GUIDELINE	COMPLIANCE UNDER THE AGENCY PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE
Are travel corridors (spruce/subalpine fir forested areas near natural openings with limited human activity and an adequate prey base (prefers carrion) (Ruggiero et al. 1994) found in or near the project area? Any impacts?	Travel corridors are potentially present within the project area. However, The IDFG has listed the project area as a predicted low use area (IDFG 2014).
Are guidelines for linkage habitat being met for species with large territories?	Yes. No large-scale vegetation management activities or large infrastructure developments (such as large roads/highways) that would have the potential to inhibit movement along travel corridors for species with large territories would occur with this project.
Known records documenting presence of wolverine occurring or traveling through or near the project area?	There are no reported sightings of wolverines in or near the project area.
Is occurrence expected in or near the project area?	Multiple recent observations have occurred in Southeast Idaho and presence of wolverine within/adjacent to the project area is possible (USFS 2018).
Wolverines are generally described as opportunistic omnivores in summer and primarily scavengers in winter. (Ruggiero et. al 1994, 111-114); any impact to prey base?	The project may displace big game species which provide a source of carrion. This impact would be short-term as big game species would likely move back into the project area following reclamation.
Wolverine Guideline 1: Restrict intrusive human disturbance within one mile around known active den sites, March 1 to May 15. (RFP 3-33)	No active den sites occur within one mile of the project area.

2.8 Land Use

The project would comply with CNF RFP standards and guidelines transportation and utility corridors (**Table 22**).

Table 22 Compliance with Applicable CNF RFP Standards and Guidelines for Transportation and Utility Corridors

STANDARD/GUIDELINE	COMPLIANCE UNDER THE AGENCY PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE
<p>Transportation and Utility Corridors Standard 1: Existing and proposed rights-of-way of the following types shall be designated as corridors (Rx 8.1). This does not prevent the inclusion of lower-rated transmission lines or smaller pipelines within the corridors.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Communication lines and zones for interstate use. • Railroads. • Federal, state, interstate, and forest highways. • Electric transmission lines of 66KV and greater, including fiberoptics. • Oil, gas, slurry, or other pipelines 10 inches or larger in diameter. (RFP 3-10) 	<p>The project ROW is not a designated corridor. However, the CNF proposes to amend the CNF RFP to establish a permanent 20-foot wide utility corridor that would contain the requested ROW and to issue a Special Use Authorization (SUA) for a pipeline to be installed within that corridor across NFS land with a 50-foot construction (temporary) ROW width (25-foot width in wetlands and aquatic influence zones).</p>
Transportation and Utility Corridors Standard 2:	The Crow Creek Pipeline would increase reliability of

STANDARD/GUIDELINE	COMPLIANCE UNDER THE AGENCY PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE
Proponents of new facilities within existing corridors, and new corridor routes, shall demonstrate that the proposal is in the public interest, and that no other reasonable alternative exists to public land routing. (RFP 3-10)	natural gas supplies to residents in Afton, Wyoming and reduce costs and risk associated with storage, processing, and transportation of liquified natural gas (LNG). Additionally, because the LNG is presently trucked to Afton, the pipeline would reduce the number of truck miles driven, thereby reducing emissions, diesel consumption, and increase safety by removing trucks carrying flammable materials from the affected highways. Due to the extent of NFS lands between Montpelier, Idaho and Afton, Wyoming and limited feasible route options, avoiding the need for crossing NFS lands and subsequently needing an SUA was evaluated, but determined not to be possible.
Transportation and Utility Corridors Standard 3: Allow for essential access for repair and maintenance of facilities within energy corridors. (RFP 3-10)	Access to the ROW would be retained, although access in some areas would be non-motorized.
Transportation and Utility Corridors Guideline 1: Utility corridors should have irregular clearing widths and follow patterns of existing natural openings. (RFP 3-10)	Revegetation of the ROW following construction would follow patterns of existing vegetation.
Transportation and Utility Corridors Guideline 3: Utility structures should be made to blend with the existing landscape to the extent feasible. (RFP 3-10)	The only structures on NFS would be ROW markers that would be small and unobtrusive from a distance.
Transportation and Utility Corridors Guideline 4: Where feasible, new facilities should be limited to existing rights-of-way having widening potential. (RFP 3-10)	The majority of the 49.1-mile proposed pipeline is designed to be collocated with roadways. It only deviates from existing roadways where necessary.
Transportation and Utility Corridors Guideline 5: Before new corridors or widening of existing corridors are approved, consideration should be given to wheeling, uprating, or multiple circuiting of transmission lines or increasing pipeline capacity by addition of compressors or looping. (RFP 3-10)	There are not existing pipelines supplying Afton, Wyoming. As a result, the option of increasing capacity is not available.
Transportation and Utility Corridors Guideline 6: Avoid parallel corridors. Consolidate facilities within existing energy corridors where feasible. (RFP 3-10)	There are no parallel utility corridors along the proposed pipeline.
Transportation and Utility Corridors Guideline 7: Pipelines and other related utilities should share utility corridors except as needed to meet other resource goals. (RFP 3-11)	There are no other utility corridors along the selected route or any of the alternative routes

2.9 Cultural Resources

Compliance with applicable USFS management directions for Cultural Resources is summarized in **Table 23**.

Table 23 Compliance with Applicable CNF RFP Standards and Guidelines for Cultural Resources

STANDARD/GUIDELINE	COMPLIANCE UNDER THE AGENCY PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE
Cultural Resources Standard 1: Cultural resources inventories shall be conducted in consultation with the Idaho State Historic Preservation Office, Local Native American Tribes, and interested individuals or organizations likely to have knowledge or interest in the historic properties in the area. (RFP 3-41)	As explained in Section 3.13 of the FEIS, a Class III cultural resource inventory was conducted on NFS lands.
Cultural Resources Standard 2: Unevaluated cultural resource sites shall be treated as significant until comprehensive evaluations are completed. (RFP 3-41)	As explained in Section 3.13 of the FEIS, a Class III cultural resource inventory was conducted on NFS lands.
Cultural Resources Guideline 1: Management plans for each historic property nominated to the National Register of Historic Places should be developed within 5 years. (RFP 3-41)	As explained in Section 3.13 of the FEIS, no sites were considered eligible for the National Register of Historic Places.

3. REFERENCES

- Apa, A. D. 1998. Habitat use and movements of sympatric sage and Columbian sharp tailed grouse in southeastern Idaho. Dissertation, University of Idaho, Moscow, Idaho.
- Connelly, J. W., M. A. Schroeder, A. R. Sands, and C. E. Braun. 2000. Guidelines to manage sage grouse population and their habitats. *Wildlife Society Bulletin*, 28(4):967-985.
- Dobrich, Valerie W. 2008. Northern Goshawk Population Monitoring and Inventory. Report 2008 Final. USDA, Caribou-Targhee National Forest, Idaho Falls, Idaho. 31 pp. plus appendices
- Dobrich, Valerie W. 2009. Northern Goshawk Population Monitoring and Inventory. Report 2009 Final. USDA, Caribou-Targhee National Forest, Idaho Falls, Idaho. 20 pp. plus appendices and maps.
- Dobrich, Valerie W. 2010. Northern Goshawk Population Monitoring and Inventory. Report 2010 USDA, Caribou-Targhee National Forest, Idaho Falls, Idaho.
- Dobrich, Valerie W. 2011. Northern Goshawk Population Monitoring and Inventory. Report 2011 USDA, Caribou-Targhee National Forest, Idaho Falls, Idaho.
- Dobrich, Valerie W. 2012. Northern Goshawk Population Monitoring and Inventory. Report 2012 USDA, Caribou-Targhee National Forest, Idaho Falls, Idaho.
- Graham, R.T., R. L. Rodriguez, K. M. Paulin, R. L. Player, A. P. Heap, and R. Williams. 1999. The northern goshawk in Utah: habitat assessment and management recommendations. General Technical Report RMRS-GTR-22. U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Rocky Mountain Research Station, Odgen, Utah. http://www.fs.fed.us/rm/pubs/rmrs_gtr022.html
- Groves, C. R., B. Butterfield, A. Lippincott, B. Csuti, and J. M. Scott. 1997. Atlas of Idaho's Wildlife. Idaho Department of Fish and Game. Boise, Idaho.
- Hayward, G. D. 1994. Flammulated, Boreal, and Great Gray Owls in the United States: A Technical Conservation Assessment. USDA- FS GTR RM-253.
- Idaho Department of Fish and Game (IDFG). 2000. Results of the grouse lek survey near Geneva, Idaho. Unpublished document.
- Idaho Department of Fish and Game (IDFG). 2002. Results of the grouse lek survey between Montpelier and Georgetown, Idaho. Unpublished document.
- Idaho Department of Fish and Game (IDFG). 2004a. Sage-grouse lek Database. Idaho Department of Fish and Game Unpublished document.
- Idaho Department of Fish and Game (IDFG). 2004b. Sharp-tailed grouse lek Database. Idaho Department of Fish and Game Unpublished document. [see wildlife map]
- Idaho Department of Fish and Game (IDFG). 2004c. Results of the grouse lek survey of Caribou Basin and Wayan, Idaho. Unpublished document.

- Idaho Department of Fish and Game (IDFG). 2005. Idaho Comprehensive Wildlife Conservation Strategy. Idaho Conservation Data Center, Idaho Department of Fish and Game, Boise, Idaho. Available online at <http://fishandgame.idaho.gov/public/wildlife/cwcs/>.
- Idaho Department of Fish and Game (IDFG). 2014. Management Plan for the Conservation of Wolverines in Idaho 2014-2019. Idaho Department of Fish and Game, Boise, Idaho. Available online at <https://idfg.idaho.gov/old-web/docs/wildlife/planWolverine.pdf>
- Idaho Department of Lands (IDL). 2015. Idaho State Board of Land Commissioners Greater Sage-Grouse Conservation Plan. April 21, 2015.
- McDaniel, G. W. 2006. Northern Goshawk Population Monitoring and Inventory. Final Report 2005. Caribou-Targhee National Forest, Idaho Falls, Idaho.
- McDaniel, G. W. 2007. Northern Goshawk Population Monitoring and Inventory. Final Report 2006. Caribou-Targhee National Forest, Idaho Falls, Idaho.
- McDaniel, G. W. 2008. Northern Goshawk Population Monitoring and Inventory. Final Report 2007. USDA, Caribou-Targhee National Forest, Idaho Falls, Idaho.
- Miller, K. E. G., R. Dixon, and C. E. Harris. 2005. Idaho Bat Conservation Plan, Draft. Idaho Bat Working Group. Boise, Idaho.
- Ovard, Dave. 2013. 2013 Northern Goshawk Population Monitoring and Inventory For the Caribou National Forest Completion Date: October 2014.
- Pierson, E. D., M. C. Wackenhut, J.C. Altenbach, P. Bradley, P. Call, D. L. Genter, C. E. Harris, B. L. Keller, B. Lengus, L. Lewis, B. Luce, K. W. Navo, J. M. Perkins, S. Smith, and L. Welch. 1999. Species conservation assessment and conservation strategy for the Townsend's big-eared bat (*Corynorhinus townsendii*). Idaho State Conservation Effort, Idaho Department of Fish and Game, Boise, Idaho.
- Ruggiero, L.F., K. B. Aubry, S. W. Buskirk, G. M. Koehler, C. J. Krebs, K. S. McKelvey, and J. R. Squires, editors. 1994. Ecology and conservation of lynx in the United States. University Press of Colorado, Boulder, USA.
- Stantec. 2018. Wildlife Resources Technical Report. Lower Valley Energy, Crow Creek Pipeline EIS. October 2018.
- Stantec. 2018a. Technical Report: Wildlife Resources.
- Trec, Inc. 2005 Northern goshawk monitoring and Inventory on the Caribou-Targhee National Forest, Final Report. Submitted by TREC, Inc. Rigby, Idaho (Errata – North Fork territory should be D2-05-2 on pages 9, 11, 17, 19, 23, and 25.)
- U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS), Idaho Department of Fish and Game, Montana Fish, Wildlife & Parks, Wyoming Game and Fish Department, Nez Perce Tribe, National Park Service, Blackfeet Nation, Confederated Salish and Kootenai Tribes, Wind River Tribes, Confederated Colville Tribes, Spokane Tribe of Indians, Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife, Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife, Utah Department of Natural Resources, and USDA Wildlife Services. 2016. Northern Rocky Mountain Wolf Recovery Program 2015 Interagency Annual Report. M.D. Jimenez and S.A. Becker, eds. USFWS, Ecological Services, 585 Shepard Way, Helena, Montana, 59601.

- Ulliman, M.J., A.Sands and T.Hemker. 1998. Conservation Plan for Columbian Sharp-tailed Grouse and Its Habitats in Idaho – Draft.
- US Forest Service (USFS). 2000. Forest Plan Monitoring and Evaluation Report 1997-1999. Caribou-Targhee National Forest. Idaho Falls, Idaho.
- US Forest Service (USFS). 2001. Forest Plan Monitoring and Evaluation Report 2000-2001. Caribou-Targhee National Forest. Idaho Falls, Idaho.
- US Forest Service (USFS). 2003a. Revised Forest Plan for the Caribou National Forest. U.S. Department of Agriculture. Idaho Falls, Idaho.
- US Forest Service (USFS). 2003c. Final Environmental Impact Statement for the Revised Forest Plan for the Caribou National Forest. U.S. Department of Agriculture. Idaho Falls, Idaho.
- US Forest Service (USFS). 2010. Caribou National Forest Wildlife White Papers, Unpublished documents including Wildlife Maps and Photos.
- US Forest Service (USFS). 2012. Idaho bald eagle midwinter bald eagle count. Unpublished data. January 10, 2012. USFS, Caribou-Targhee National Forest, Montpelier, Idaho.
- US Forest Service (USFS). 2013. Idaho bald eagle midwinter bald eagle count. Unpublished data. January 8, 2013. USFS, Caribou-Targhee National Forest, Montpelier, Idaho.
- US Forest Service (USFS). 2014. Idaho bald eagle midwinter bald eagle count. Unpublished data. January 9, 2014. USFS, Caribou-Targhee National Forest, Montpelier, Idaho.
- US Forest Service (USFS). 2018. Personal communication with Devon Green, USFS wildlife biologist, regarding North American Wolverine occurrence in Idaho.
- US Forest Service (USFS). 2019. Greater Sage-grouse Draft Record of Decision and Land Management Plan Amendments for National Forest System Land in Idaho. Boise, Caribou-Targhee, Salmon-Challis, and Sawtooth National Forests and Curlew National Grassland. United States Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Intermountain Region. August.
- WBWG (Western Bat Working Group). 2005. Bat Species Accounts - Developed For the 1998 Reno Biennial Meeting, Updated at the 2005 Portland Biennial Meeting by the Western Bat Working Group: EUMA - Euderma maculatum – Spotted bat. 2005 Update by: Carol Chambers and Michael Herder, Original account by: Bob Luce <http://www.wbwg.org> accessed 1-20-06.